

## REMARKS

This current Reply is responsive to a current and Final Office Action dated 03/09/2006. In this current Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13-15, and 29-37 were examined, and claims 10, 11, 13-15, and 29-37 were rejected.

By this Reply, claims 10, 11, 13-15, and 29-37 are canceled. New claims 38-71 are added. Hence, claims 38-71 are now presented for examination.

Of claims 38-71, claims 38, 54, 70, and 71 are independent.

It is respectfully submitted that no art of record, including the art applied in the current Office Action (e.g., Nolan, Kekic et al, and/or Mikkonen), either alone or in any combination, anticipates or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other elements of their respective claims. Specifically, each of independent claims 38, 54, 70, and 71 recites:

(i) *a first pane, a second pane, a third pane, and a fourth pane,*  
along with particular characteristics, aspects, and/or features of each;  
and

(ii) *a work queue [that] includes multiple tasks that are*  
*assigned to be performed, at least partly, by the respective*  
*[computer or member] that corresponds to the selected [computer or*  
*member] representation.*

1       The previous arguments in the preceding Reply (filed on/around  
2 12/16/2005) are hereby repeated herein by incorporation by reference. These  
3 previous arguments include, by way of example but not limitation, those arguments  
4 directed to the impropriety of combining Nolan with Kekic et al. and the  
5 impropriety of combining Nolan with Kekic et al. with Mikkonen as well as the  
6 dissimilarity between the recited *work queue* and the “window 2300” of Nolan.

7  
8  
9       Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 38 and 54 have been  
10 provided above. They have dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly  
11 from them. Although each also includes additional element(s) militating toward  
12 allowability, the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given  
13 above in connection with their respective independent claims.

1 CONCLUSION

2  
3 It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 38-71 are allowable. It is  
4 therefore respectfully requested that the Office pass the instant Patent Application  
5 to issue with all due haste.  
6

7 Respectfully Submitted,

8 Date: 5/8/2006

9 By: Keith W. Saunders  
10 Keith W. Saunders  
11 Reg. No. 41,462  
12 (509) 324-9256 x238  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25